

Robert G. Wyckoff v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and Kenneth F. Kaczmarek
Civil Action No. 00-2248

Hearsay Designations in Connection with Plaintiff's Exhibit 99 (VHS Tape MetLife Metro News, September 1998)

Although Metropolitan Life Insurance Company ("MetLife") maintains the position that the entirety of Plaintiff's Exhibit 99 constitutes inadmissible hearsay, and MetLife does not waive its right to renew this objection to its admissibility at trial, MetLife hereby designates the following excerpts from the videotape transcript as objectionable pursuant to the hearsay rules of the Federal Rules of Evidence.

Page of Transcript	Designation Number	Reason for Hearsay Objection
1	1	<u>Hearsay</u> – The comments attributed to the speaker are not subject to substantiation or cross examination.
2	2	<u>Double Hearsay</u> – Statement attributed to an unidentified customer who is not available for cross examination.
2	3	<u>Hearsay/ Speculation</u> – The comments attributed to the speaker are not subject to substantiation or cross examination
3	4	<u>Hearsay</u> – The comments attributed to the speakers are not subject to substantiation or cross examination
4	5	<u>Hearsay/ Speculation</u> – The comments attributed to the speaker are not subject to substantiation or cross examination
7	6	<u>Hearsay</u> – The comments attributed to the speaker are not subject to substantiation or cross examination
9	7	<u>Hearsay</u> – The comments attributed to the speaker are not subject to substantiation or cross examination
10	8	<u>Hearsay</u> – The comments attributed to the speaker are not subject to substantiation or cross examination
10	9	<u>Hearsay</u> – The comments attributed to the speaker are not subject to substantiation or cross examination